

The New Anti-Japanese Agitation

A new anti-Japanese agitation has been set under way in California.

What this agitation is, what the real facts in the situation are, and what it means is told in this pamphlet.


The agitation is a serious one because apart from its failure to solve the problems involved, it strengthens the arm of the military and autocratic powers in Japan.

Sidney L. Gulick
Secretary of the
Commission on Relations with the Orient
of the
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

105 East 22d Street, New York City



Received Apr. 1920



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Columbia University Libraries

THE NEW ANTI-JAPANESE AGITATION

For fifty years California has been the scene of repeated waves of anti-Asiatic feeling. During the seventies, eighties and nineties of the last century those waves of feeling were directed against the Chinese. For two decades now they have been hurled against the Japanese. Beginning in the spring of 1919 a new and especially virulent wave has been apparent.

Before studying this last recurrence of the periodic trouble, it will pay us to look back a little into history.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION

Chinese immigration sprang up in 1850 when nearly 500 Chinese arrived in California responding to the "gold fever" that stirred the whole world. By the end of 1852 it was estimated that some 20,000 to 25,000 were at work in that state. For a few years they were welcomed. Their industry, cleanliness, unobtrusiveness, adaptability, patience and readiness to turn to every kind of work even the hardest and most disagreeable made them highly acceptable to all kinds of employers. Governor McDougal even recommended in 1852 a system of land grants to induce the further immigration and settlement of Chinese—"one of the most worthy of our newly adopted citizens."

But before the close of that decade anti-Chinese feeling developed in the mining regions and in the cities, becoming violent in the seventies. Race riots occurred, anti-Chinese legislation was urged, Congress began to study the situation and Committees of various kinds made investigations and reports. The result was a negotiated change in 1880 of the treaty of 1868 that provided for free immigration, and in 1882 the law suspending Chinese immigration for ten years was enacted. This law was re-enacted twice and in 1904, in spite of the pledge of the treaty to the contrary was made absolute and permanent.

During the successive periods of anti-Chinese agitation, expression was often given to judgments most adverse to Chinese. The California Senate Memorial to Congress (1876) contains this:

"Impregnable to all the influences of Anglo-Saxon life, they remain the same stolid Asiatics that have floated on the rivers and slaved in the fields of China for thirty centuries of time. . . . We thus find one-sixth of our entire population composed of Chinese coolies, not involuntary, but, by the unalterable structure of their intellectual being, voluntary slaves. . . . Is it not possible that free labor, unable to compete with these foreign serfs . . . may unite in all the horrors of riot and insurrection, and defying the civil power, extirpate with fire and sword those who rob them of their bread, yet yield no tribute to the State?"

And Frank M. Pixley, representing the Municipality of San Francisco before the Congressional Committee of 1876 made this statement:

"The Chinese are inferior to any race God ever made. . . . I think there are none so low. . . . Their people have got the perfection of crimes of 4,000 years. . . . The Divine Wisdom has said that He would divide this country and the world as a heritage of five great families; that to the Blacks He would give Africa; to the Red Man He would give America; and Asia He would give to the Yellow races. He inspired us with the determination, not only to have prepared our own inheritance, but to have stolen from the Red Man, America; and it is now settled that the Saxon, American or European groups of families, the White Race, is to have the inheritance of Europe and America and that the Yellow races are to be confined to what the Almighty originally gave them; and as they are not a favored people, they are not to be permitted to steal from us what we have robbed the American savage of. . . . I believe that the Chinese have no souls to save, and if they have, they are not worth the saving."

The Scott Act of 1888 was so drastic and so contrary to the treaty that a test case was made and carried to the United States Supreme Court. The judgment sustained the validity of the law because it was the last act of Congress but it was added: "The question whether our Government was justified in disregarding its engagements with another nation is not one for the determination of the courts. . . . This court is not a censor of the morals of the other departments of the Government."

But a remarkable change has been taking place of late in California in the attitude toward Chinese. Many are beginning to speak a good word for "John." His fine qualities are being appreciated and commended. Whether or not he has a soul to save is not the point—he has hands and feet and a spirit to do honest hard work. They begin to see many good qualities in him now. Some are even proposing to import Chinese coolies by the hundred thousand—to meet the shortage of labor.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Large Japanese immigration began in 1900 as a result of the annexation of Hawaii. In that one year 10,000 landed in San Francisco and in the following seven years some 40,000 more were admitted to Continental United States. Economic competition and mutual sharp practice led inevitably to ill-will and the development of race feeling.

A crisis was reached in 1907. Californians were demanding that the Chinese exclusion laws be applied to Japanese. Japan wished to avoid the humiliation of such action, and accordingly Japan made an arrangement with the United States to stop all new labor immigration. This is known as the Gentlemen's Agreement. Her faithful observance of that agreement has been sufficiently shown by the writer in another paper. The anti-

Japanese agitation subsided for a season but in 1912-13 was suddenly revived by politicians on the charge that Japanese were a serious menace because they were buying up all the choicest agricultural lands. The agitation led to the enactment of the "Anti-Alien Land Law" in 1913 which caused quite a strain in international relations. Secretary Bryan was sent to California to persuade the Legislature and Governor Johnson to desist. That effort apparently aggravated the determination of Californians to enact the law. Many seriously expected war to follow between Japan and America.

Japan pushed her case diplomatically but without success. She has steadily maintained that the law violates the treaty. The Department of State has replied that if Japan thinks so, the way to settle the matter is to bring in a test case. There the matter rests.

After the law had been passed it became known that Japanese ownership of land in California all told was the trivial amount of 12,726 acres, out of a total of 27,931,444 acres of farm lands of which only 11,389,894 had been improved.

THE NEW AGITATION

The renewed agitation began in the spring of 1919. The attack this time is quite novel. The charge of race inferiority, so vigorous in 1907 and 1913, has been dropped. On the contrary their essential equality is freely granted—at least in argument. The charge now is that they have been entering in such large numbers, have such a high birthrate and are buying up such large areas of land in the names of their infant children that the supremacy of the white race on the Pacific Coast is seriously threatened.

These charges have been popularized and spread broadcast over the Pacific Coast by Mr. V. S. McClatchy, editor of the Sacramento "Bee," by Senator Inman and a group of politicians in California. They have been given place and standing in Congress and before the country by Senator Phelan of San Francisco. The statistics of Japanese births in California are being so presented as to cause widespread belief and genuine anxiety.

A society has been formed in California to propagate these ideas throughout the United States,—“The California Oriental Exclusion League.” In its appeal to its constituency for funds it says that “an educational campaign throughout the United States” is being prepared in order that this “problem in its true light can be brought before the people.” “Able writers will cover the subject in all the large magazines . . . moving pictures will be shown throughout the country; speakers and literature will present the problem before national conventions.”

THE NEW ANTI-JAPANESE PROGRAM

As on the occasion of former waves of agitation, so now, a program of legislation is presented to the nation. The proposals are drastic and far-reaching. Since they concern the permanent relations of America not only with Japan but also with China and every other Asiatic people, citizens of the United States should give them careful consideration. The program is one that concerns us all. It is not a peculiarly or narrowly Californian question.

The proposed remedies are—

1. Cancellation of the "Gentlemen's Agreement."
2. Exclusion of "picture brides."
3. Rigorous exclusion of Japanese as immigrants.
4. Confirmation and legalization of the policy that Asiatics shall be forever barred from American citizenship.
5. Amendment to Sec. 1, of Article XIV of the Federal Constitution providing that no child born in the United States of foreign parents shall be considered an American citizen unless both parents are of a race that is eligible to citizenship.

Mr. McClatchy also proposed as a sixth item the following:

6. Provide such labor as may be necessary for the development and prosperity of the country, and which cannot be had here or secured from desirable immigration, by bringing in Chinese for a fixed term of years, confining their activities to certain localities and certain industries so that they cannot offer an economic menace to American labor and send them back to China when the need for their services has ceased.

HEARINGS IN WASHINGTON

The program outlined above was presented to the Committees on Immigration of the Senate and House of Representatives in September and October, 1919. The hearings were published in due time and furnish the authoritative statements of its outstanding advocates.

Since they propose a program of propaganda that cannot fail to stir up bitter race feeling both here and in Japan and a course of legislation that will surely strain American-Japanese relations and one also that in the writer's judgment cannot fail to be injurious to our own country and to California especially, it is highly important that Americans should study the proposals with care. Are their alleged facts true and their arguments valid?

CHARGES AS TO JAPAN'S VIOLATION OF THE GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT

Throughout the statements by Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy the charge is repeatedly made that some kind of new legislation is needed because Japan has "grossly violated" the

Gentlemen's Agreement. The writer has examined this charge with some care and has presented the detailed discussion in another paper. Here, therefore, he may merely summarize by saying that the charge is not supported by facts. It is true that Japanese population in California has increased while that of the Chinese has decreased. That fact, however, does not prove Japan's violation of the "Agreement." It only shows that Japanese immigrants, like European immigrants, bring their wives and children after them and not like Chinese coolies who have been content to labor on for decades without their families. For convincing statistical disproof of the charges the reader is referred to the paper referred to.

A careful study, however, of the statements by the two chief advocates of the program for drastic anti-Japanese legislation shows that they make many wild assertions wholly unjustified by facts. Their allegations as to Japanese population in California, and in the United States, as to the Japanese birthrate, as to the "Picture Bride" movement and as to the non-assimilability of the Japanese, are so wide from the facts that the argument for their legislative program falls entirely to pieces.

ALLEGED INCREASE OF JAPANESE POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA

"Since the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' was adopted in 1907 the Japanese population in California has increased by 50,000 . . . most of that 50,000 are laborers." (House Hearings, p. 247.) That Mr. McClatchy is speaking about increase by immigration is clear, for he says they are "laborers." None of the children born in California since 1907 can yet be considered "laborers." What now are the facts?

The total arrivals in Continental United States between July 1, 1907 and June 30, 1919 were 89,282, while the total departures were 73,566. Increase by immigration therefore for the period to which Mr. McClatchy refers was 15,715. This, however, deals with the entire area of Continental United States. It is not probable that more than 10,000 of this number settled in California. His figure is therefore five times too great, a rather serious discrepancy.

But are these 10,000 "mostly laborers"? Mr. Caminetti informed the Senate Committee on Immigration that between 1909 and 1919, the number of Japanese males who left the United States (including Hawaii) exceeded those who arrived by 13,579. (Senate Hearings, p. 31.) The 10,000, therefore, must be mostly women—"wives." Mr. McClatchy evidently is not well posted on the situation.

EXAGGERATIONS AS TO JAPANESE POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA

Japanese population in California, Mr. McClatchy repeatedly states, is 100,000. (House Hearings, pp. 257 and 278.) What are the facts?

The Census of 1910 shows that the total Japanese population in California was 41,356. The Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration (Table A) show that the increase of population in Continental United States by immigration between July 1, 1910 and June 30, 1919 was 15,966. Of these we may safely assume that not more than 10,000 settled in California. According to the Biennial Report of the California State Board of Health Japanese children born in California between July 1, 1910, and June 30, 1919, was 27,787 (births for 1919 estimated at 4,700). Making allowances for deaths both of the children born in California (4,208) and of those Japanese recorded in the Census of 1910, and of the arrivals since 1910 (not definitely calculable), we shall not be far astray if we say that the total population of California in July, 1919, is approximately 72,000 or 73,000, somewhat less than Mr. McClatchy's assertions.

Mr. McClatchy's constant insistence moreover on the steady inflow of 10,000 to 12,000 immigrants annually (*ibid.*, p. 247) into the United States is quite misleading because he ignores the large fraction that goes to Hawaii and also the 6,000 to 8,000 annual departures.

EXAGGERATIONS AS TO JAPANESE POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Japanese population in Continental United States is repeatedly affirmed to be 150,000 (pp. 257 and 278). But what are the facts? The Census shows that in 1910 the number of Japanese in Continental United States, both alien and American-born, numbered 72,157. The increase by immigration to June 30, 1919, was 15,966. The Census for 1910 shows that the number of Japanese children five years old and under in Continental United States exceeded those in California by 42 per cent. Assuming that the ratio still holds, the increase of Japanese children for the period 1911-1919, making no allowance for those children who will have returned to Japan, will be approximately 33,487. This gives a total of 121,605, without allowing for deaths during the nine years among the original number (72,157) nor among those added by immigration (15,966). The true figure for the Japanese population in 1919 therefore is probably somewhere between 115,000 and 120,000. This again is slightly less than the number claimed by Mr. McClatchy.

THE ALLEGED SIXFOLD INCREASE IN JAPANESE POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES

"Since 1900 Japanese population in the United States has increased sixfold" (Senate Hearing, p. 35; House Hearing, p. 243). This assertion is repeatedly made by Mr. McClatchy and others as though it were a significant and ominous fact. To prove the charge, Japanese population in the United States in 1900 is first given which according to the United States Census is 24,326, and then it is compared with the alleged present Japanese population—150,000. The relation of 150,000 to 24,326 is indeed sixfold.

The argument, however, is utterly pointless, for the Gentlemen's Agreement did not get into full working order till the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1908. Since that date up to June 30, 1919, the total increase of Japanese population by immigration was only 10,968,* most, if not all, of whom were women and children. The Japanese population in Continental United States July 1, 1908, was approximately 77,000 and is at present as we have already seen less than 120,000, an increase, at the maximum of 55 per cent, for a true comparison, instead of 600 per cent as Mr. McClatchy proclaims—for his unfair comparison.

THE "ALARMING" JAPANESE BIRTHRATE

The backbone, however, of the anti-Japanese arguments as to the Japanese menace is the alleged extraordinary birthrate. This is declared to be "five times greater than that of the whites" (*ibid.*, p. 252-279). Mr. McClatchy does not state the exact birthrate of either Japanese or Whites, but from the figures given in regard to births and population in Sacramento, of Japanese and of Whites, the white birthrate is apparently 14.3 per 1,000. Five times this would make Japanese birthrate 71.5 per 1,000. If the figures for the white births are correct, the Sacramento whites are committing race suicide. The birthrate of the United States is about 24 per thousand and that of France 18—while that of Sacramento is only 14, if Mr. McClatchy's figures are really correct.

These reckonings, however, are quite illusive as they ignore many important facts as to the make-up of the white and Japanese populations in California. Among the former are many old persons and children in their 'teens and also large numbers of retired people of means from the eastern states. Each of

* The apparent discrepancy between the figures of this paragraph and those of the second paragraph above is due to the fact that during the two years between July 1, 1908, and June 30, 1910, Japanese emigration exceeded immigration by 4,998. The Japanese population in Continental United States accordingly was greater in the summer of 1908 by about 5,000 than it was when the census was taken in 1910.

these factors tends to produce a low white birthrate. Among the Japanese on the other hand are few if any old persons, and relatively few children in their 'teens, Japanese families being at the stage of highest productivity. The vast majority of the wives are between 20 and 30 years of age. These facts completely vitiate the assertions as to Japanese birthrate.

If the Japanese population in California were in fact what the agitators say, 100,000—then the birthrate in 1918 was 43.6 per thousand. This, however, is less than the birthrate of the immigration population in Massachusetts in 1910. That rate was 49.1. If the Japanese population in California in 1918 was about 70,000 then the Japanese birthrate was approximately 63 per thousand. This rate is no doubt high. But this is natural because of the peculiar age character of the group. High birthrates have been recognized as holding among every group of recent immigrants.

To make a scientific comparison of Japanese and white birthrate, since the Japanese women are almost entirely in their twenties, we should compare with them white married women of that age. Unfortunately, such figures are not available.

Since a valid comparison of Japanese and white birthrates in California is impracticable, it may be well to ask as to the Japanese birthrate in Japan. Between 1889 and 1913 official statistics show that the rate varied between 28.6 and 33.7 per thousand. The birthrate for twenty-seven different countries from 1881 to 1910 is given in the American Year Book for 1915 (p. 712). The rates vary from 41.7 to 19.6. Japan stands thirteenth in the list.

ALLEGATIONS AS TO PICTURE BRIDES

Both Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy are especially vigorous in attacking the "picture brides" brought over as they say for "breeding purposes" in order to violate the California law as to land ownership (*ibid.*, pp. 190-191 and 250-251).

In the first place they greatly exaggerate their number—they say 20,323 in the last five years. Senator Phelan specified that of this number 6,864 landed at Hawaii, and 13,913 in Continental United States.

As a matter of fact, as the writer has shown in detail in his article on "Japan's Faithful Observance of the Gentlemen's Agreement," the total number of "Picture Brides" admitted to San Francisco and Seattle during the years 1915-1919 was 3,846. The total number of "wives," including the "brides," admitted to Continental United States during those same years was 13,563.

And in the next place they are wholly in error as to the rate at which these alleged "picture brides" have children. They assert that "one every year" is the plan and practice. But what are the facts. If we ignore all the women in California before

1909 and allow that two-thirds of all the "wives" admitted to the United States since 1909 settled in California and then estimate that each has a baby every year, Japanese babies for 1918 should have been 14,068 and for 1919—16,195. The recorded births in 1918 numbered 4,365, while even Mr. McClatchy does not estimate more than 5,000 for 1919.

These figures illustrate the amazing absurdities into which agitators fall when they rely on imagination for their figures instead of holding fast to solid facts.

ALLEGATIONS AS TO JAPANESE OWNERSHIP OF LAND IN CALIFORNIA

From the descriptions of the Japanese aggression (e. g., *ibid.*, pp. 258-259), one would suppose that Japanese are taking actual possession of vast areas of land. "The Japanese are rapidly securing control of everything." "We have already 25,000 native-born Japanese in California entitled to hold land through guardians and the number is being increased each year by 4,000 or 5,000" (p. 260).

The question naturally arises as to how many parents are actually purchasing land in the names of their infant children? Is it not remarkable that neither Mr. McClatchy nor any one else gives a single concrete statistical statement? They know there are some—but to make the picture as effective as possible they conjure up the whole possibility. When the Japanese scare of 1913 was staged it was stated that Japanese were purchasing all the best agricultural lands in California. The charge led to the enactment of the Anti-Alien Land law of that year. It later became known, as already noted, that the total amount bought by Japanese up to that date was 12,726 acres owned by 331 persons.

But what is the situation today? According to Japanese figures Japanese now [1918] own 527 farms totaling 29,105 acres. Apparently, out of the families having, as alleged 25,000 children and over, some 196 have availed themselves of the opportunity to buy land in accordance with the provisions of the laws, and they have actually bought 16,379 acres!! Until the anti-Japanese agitators bring forward more appalling statistics than these, it surely ought to be difficult to get the whole country into a fever of excitement over this question.

THE FAMOUS TOWN OF FLORIN

"Today there isn't a single one of those 5 and 10-acre pieces of land that isn't in the hands of Japanese. The whites have melted away. Several years ago there was a newspaper of Sacramento delivered to the white people in carts. Today there isn't a white person to deliver it to" (*ibid.*, p. 258). "Today

there is not a single white family or person in that strawberry district" (S. H., p. 48).

These startling assertions are made in regard to Florin situated some eight or nine miles south of Sacramento.

The writer enjoys the acquaintance of two correspondents in Florin, both American citizens and both well acquainted with the Japanese there. One of them, a vineyardist, one of the "old residents," replying to my question regarding the accuracy of Mr. McClatchy's assertions wrote:

"I cannot account for statements of this kind because they are not fact. It is true that the 'Bee' (of which Mr. McClatchy is an editor) carrier only covers a small portion of the route where formerly deliveries were made—all this, however, was before the days of Rural Free Delivery. If I were to say that a couple of hundred copies of the different Sacramento papers, including the 'Bee' were now delivered on the four R. F. D. routes in the Florin district, I am sure I would be far inside the figures.

"The statement is so often made that the Japanese send all their money home that many people believe it. I can only say in refutation of this that I know them to be extravagant buyers of all classes of goods. Today hardly a Japanese strawberry or grape grower in this vicinity that does not possess an automobile, high-priced at that, and I hadn't noticed a Japanese manufacturer's name on them either."

My other correspondent, also a vineyardist, writes as follows:

"The 'Sacramento Union' this morning had a stab about the Japanese at Florin. . . . I asked the editor, Mr. Allen, if he had ever been to Florin and when he replied in the negative I told him I would like to take him out there and show him how the Japanese had made Florin and how it was prospering. . . . He said it would do no good, that he would rather the land would lie fallow a hundred years than to have an Oriental touch it. . . . I find the people most opposed to the Japanese are those that live in the city. . . . They think the high cost of food means the farmer is getting rich and the Japanese agriculturist should be extirpated. . . . At Florin the feeling toward the Japanese is better than it was in 1913. Mr. ——— says . . . no white race could take their place. Mr. ———, manager of the ———, is emphatically in favor of them and deplors the agitation now being made. Neither of these men were ready to speak in 1913 as they speak now. . . . San Francisco capital has come into Florin and a \$10,000 factory and packing house is being erected. This last summer the Florin Fruit Growers Association erected a \$10,000 loading and storage house and they are planning to invest as much more in a basket factory. Three years ago W. O. Davies erected a \$12,000 packing and loading house. So you can readily see the Japanese have not blighted Florin. . . . The Japanese have had a successful fruit season and are spending lavishly in automobiles, phonographs, better homes and furnishings."

Perhaps, however, a few statistics from the Florin region will make still more evident the extraordinary character of the assertions that the whites have completely "melted away" and that there remains "not a single white family or person in that strawberry district." Statistics have recently been published giving results of a "school census" in the thirty-three Sacramento county school districts, outside of Sacramento City.

It showed that there were 1,084 Japanese children under 21 years of age of whom 669 were under six. No figures of the white children were published.

In response, however, to a personal letter, we learn that the number of white children in the six districts constituting the "Florin strawberry" area is 517 under 21, of whom 209 are under six, whereas in those same six districts the corresponding figures for the Japanese were 530 and 292. Evidently in those six school districts, where Mr. McClatchy says "not a white family is left" there are several hundred—apparently about one-half of the population is white.

THE JAPANESE "MENACE"

"The opposition to Japanese immigration on the part of those who have studied it is not based on racial prejudice, but on unanswerable economic grounds. . . . The Japanese easily drive the whites out of any community in which the two civilizations meet in economic competition" (ibid., p. 275).

"I will be glad to demonstrate to the satisfaction of this Committee that the Japanese is an undesirable, both as a citizen and as an immigrant the most undesirable of all Asiatics. . . . The reason for that is not a racial prejudice" (S. H., p. 33).

What then are the economic reasons? Are they undesirable because they are lazy? Licentious? Diseased? Shiftless? Quarrelsome? Ignorant? Lawless? Criminal? Not at all. Indeed they are quite the reverse. "The reasons are complimentary rather than otherwise," says Mr. McClatchy. The Japanese "has energy and ambition. He will work very long hours. He will work for low wages at first. He has co-operation, which is greater, you might say, than in any of our labor unions" (S. H., pp. 33-34). "He is sober and industrious; he is generally law-abiding. He has respect for his superiors and parents. So far as police records go the cities don't have trouble with Japanese. . . . They are very industrious. They work very long hours for very little pay when necessary and they have absolute co-operation" (House Hearings, p. 253).

Now all these qualities would certainly tend to prove the Japanese a most valuable immigrant and citizen should he be permitted to naturalize.

What then is the ground of objection? "The combination of these qualities makes him an economic machine against which it is hopeless for the white race to compete" (S. H., p. 34). "The objections are that they are non-assimilable. They don't intermarry and we wouldn't want them to intermarry. The Japanese is always a Japanese" (H. H., p. 253). "The Japanese are rapidly securing control of everything" (p. 259). "The whites have melted away" (p. 258). "The Japanese carefully select the locality, the industries and conditions which will enable them

to make the most profit and so by competition they gradually drive the whites out. They go in as wage earners and underbid white labor and after they have driven white labor out, the price is raised. After that they insist on leasing and ownership and control of business, and they get it. And they get it simply by their concentrated method of operating" (p. 257).

In support of these general assertions a few localities are cited such as Florin (p. 258), Sacramento Valley (p. 259), Imperial Valley (p. 259), Hood River district (Oregon) (p. 259).

Statistics are presented with regard to various lines of agricultural produce. The fact that Japanese raise "90 per cent of the strawberries, and cantaloups, 80 per cent of the onions, asparagus, tomatoes, celery, lettuce and cut flowers, 55 per cent of cabbage and seed, 10 per cent of grape fruit and rice" (*ibid.*, p. 259) is cited as showing that the Japanese are driving the whites out of agriculture.

"All the money these people make," says Senator Phelan, and they are making money all the time—goes to Japan. They control many of our crops. That money does not circulate among the various trades and industries percolating back to its original source . . . but it goes from the Japanese producer who takes it out of the soil, to the Japanese middleman, to the Japanese storekeeper, to the Japanese banker and thence back to Japan" (*ibid.*, p. 189).

Are these and many similar sweeping assertions literally true? Can they be accepted as they stand? If not literally true, are they nevertheless substantially true?

The writer does not doubt that there are certain areas where Japanese constitute the majority of the population, also that certain crops are predominantly raised by Japanese. It is quite probable that in those lines of intensive agriculture for which Japanese are peculiarly fitted by stature, manual dexterity and remarkable patience, white men cannot easily compete with them, such as the cultivation of strawberries, celery, asparagus, seeds, onions, tomatoes and the like.

It sounds rather strange, however, for Senator Phelan to say that Japanese control the potato crop, when they raise only 20.8 per cent of it, or the bean crop, of which they produce only 13 per cent.

The general reply to be made to the above sweeping assertions of the anti-Japanese critics is to ask for accurate statistics. It will then be manifest that the critics are dealing in sensational exaggerations, not with sober facts.

To meet the charge that Japanese take complete possession of whatever they touch, attention may be called to the fact that according to the statistics, they raise only 13 per cent of the grapes, 23 per cent of the green vegetable, 16 per cent of the rice, 10 per cent of the cotton and 4 per cent of the fruits and nuts. These figures are not 100 per cent as they should be.

It may be well to note also that although whites in California are cultivating some 12,000,000 acres, Japanese cultivate only about 366,000 (vegetable and fruit intensive farming vs. extensive farming)—of which they own a paltry 30,000. Moreover, the total Japanese population devoted to agriculture was in 1918, according to Japanese consular statements, approximately 38,000 (of whom about 8,000 were children), while 30,000 more were in the towns and cities. The total population of California is about 3,200,000.

These cold facts make a sober student of the situation feel that the anti-Japanese critics are a bit hysterical in their sweeping assertions.

LIVINGSTON

Livingston is a town where Japanese Christians some years ago established a "colony" entirely Japanese. Their manner of life and relations to their American neighbor completely refutes the sweeping assertions that a Japanese is inevitably a menace. An important resident of Livingston, an American citizen, has recently sent the writer the following letter. Every sentence adds a new idea and is worthy of quotation in full.

"The Japanese residents of this community are of rather a high class, all of them well educated, owning their own farms for the most part, having purchased most of them previous to August 10, 1913, at which time the California Alien Land Act went into effect.

"They occupy a section of territory pretty much to themselves, having secured the land in a body and colonized it, developing it to fruits and vines, principally. They have proven themselves to be desirable citizens, sober, honest and industrious.

"They do not lower the standard of living, being ambitious to own and to live in just as good houses as their neighbors, to wear just as good clothes and drive just as good horses and automobiles.

"They pay just as high wages as others in the community and employ, very largely, labor of other nationalities.

"I do not believe that the Japanese such as we have here drive out desirable white citizens. As all good farmers do, of whatever nationality, they take the place of unsuccessful farmers at times.

"As to their being good citizens, I cannot speak too highly of the patriotism of the local Japanese. In every Liberty Loan Drive, Red Cross Drive, War Savings Stamp Drive, Y. M. C. A. Drive, and all of the various drives undertaken during the war these people did more than their share. They did not have to be solicited in this connection, but sent their own representative to ascertain what was expected of them in each case and then went that one better.

"They have their own church and kindergarten, where their children are taught the English language before entering the Public School. They have their own Protestant pastor and hold regular Christian services in their church.

"In view of the mass of misinformation which is being circulated in this connection, I am glad to be able to say something in justice, on the other side.

"If there is any other service I can render in this connection, please call on me."

It may not be known that Japanese in California invested in Liberty Loan Bonds to the extent of \$2,648,800 beside making generous responses to the Red Cross, Y. M. C. A. and other appeals. Did any other recently admitted immigrants of equal numbers do as well?

CALIFORNIA'S PROSPERITY AND JAPANESE LABOR

It would not be a very difficult matter for a person who knows the facts to show that California's prosperity since 1850 has been materially augmented by the labor of Chinese and Japanese. Their presence has not kept out workers of other races, and the values they have created by their work on roads, railroads and in breaking in new farm lands must be very large indeed. It is hard to imagine what California would have been today had she never employed any Chinese or Japanese labor.

Present day critics little appreciate how important is the contribution made today by the 40,000 to 50,000 industrious Japanese workers. Take for instance the single item of land rentals. All agree that Japanese are willing to pay high rates. If they average \$50 per acre annually, the stream of gold flowing into the hands of California landowners for rentals approximates \$16,500,000 each year. That sum certainly does not go into Japanese banks and "back to Japan"! Japanese also are good purchasers of automobiles, of house furniture and victrolas, of fertilizers for their field, of agricultural implements and of personal clothing. A considerable part of the produce, moreover, which Japanese raise is transported by American railroads, and handled by white labor.

In all these respects it cannot be denied that Japanese make good immigrants.

CAPTIOUS CRITICISM

When an impartial student begins to examine the criticism directed against the Japanese, most of it is felt to be utterly captious. Other immigrants who desire to invest their earnings in land are commended, while the Japanese are condemned. Yet they are also condemned if they send their earnings back to Japan. We forbid Japanese from becoming naturalized citizens, yet we condemn them because they do not become citizens. Immigrants of other peoples we praise when they bring their families and settle down. Japanese are condemned for doing that very same thing.

A careful examination of everything stated by anti-Japanese agitators and their spokesmen before the Senate and House Committees on Immigration does not disclose a single

item of evidence that Japanese would not make good and loyal citizens if they were allowed to naturalize.

SOME OBSERVATIONS

1. So far as Japanese are superior in economic efficiency—raise larger crops per acre, pay larger rentals and increase the land values, they are an asset and are not a menace.

2. So far as they have the good economic qualities ascribed to them they are in those respects good immigrants and have the making of good citizens.

3. So far as Japanese combine in exclusive Japanese economic groups to compete with similar non-Japanese groups, they are doing what every European race group coming to America has done, e. g., the Irish, Italians, Greeks, Russians, etc. The question naturally arises whether Americans have tried co-operation. Is Japanese exclusiveness due at all to American exclusiveness?

4. As for whites moving out of a district when Japanese move in—that has occurred in every part of the United States when a new immigration group arrives in a given locality in large numbers.

5. So far as Japanese seek to turn every economic factor to their own advantage, that is human nature, of which the whites too are not wholly lacking.

6. So far as Japanese accept low wages at first and are willing to work long hours in order to get an economic start, and later force higher wages as they find opportunity, those are characteristics of every class or race that has come to America.

7. Free or even large immigration from Japan might indeed in a few decades result in a serious menace to the white population especially if the policy of race jealousy, prejudice and unfriendly competition were steadily cultivated of the type manifested by the present anti-Japanese agitators. The writer has for years advocated a substitute for the Gentlemen's Agreement, a measure that will secure rigid restriction on an equitable basis.

8. Japanese ownership of 29,105 acres, and leasing of 336,721 acres for agricultural purposes can hardly be a serious menace in a state having some ten to fifteen million acres of as yet undeveloped agricultural lands.

9. The charge that the Japanese "doesn't make a good citizen and apparently doesn't want to make a good citizen" (p. 255) is a mere charge—without evidence. So long as the laws of naturalization are interpreted in a way to deny them citizenship how can they be expected to make good citizens, and how can they be justly condemned for not becoming such? The irrational character of this criticism is almost inconceivable.

As a matter of fact, of the immigrants that come from various countries, few give better promise of becoming better or more loyal citizens than do the Japanese. The evidence is abundant that not a few Japanese who have resided in America ten to a dozen or even a score of years, earnestly desire to become American citizens. There is every reason to believe that they would make the very best of citizens, excelling in loyalty, if we were to meet them half way.

THE REAL SITUATION

The discussions thus far have shown conclusively that Mr. McClatchy and his co-agitators make use of unscientific statistics and sensational exaggerations. The casual reader might perhaps infer, therefore, that when we deal with actual facts and scientific statistics, we shall find no real difficulties to be solved.

Such, however, is not the view of the writer. To his thinking there is a real problem. And it is a difficult one. The agitators see it in a vague way but they do not understand its real nature. The remedies, accordingly, which they propose for its solution, if adopted, would not only fail to do even what they desire, but would on the contrary aggravate the difficulty.

THE PRINCIPAL FACTS

1. Japanese population, between seventy and eighty thousand in number, has secured a firm economic foothold in California. They are remarkably industrious, thrifty, sober, reliable, law-abiding and ambitious. They cooperate effectively among themselves and constitute a compact and powerful competition.

2. Large numbers of them live in agricultural districts, where they constitute in many cases communities largely if not exclusively, Japanese. The white land owners often find it economically advantageous to sell or lease to them, for Japanese, by their intensive cultivation, can afford to pay high prices for land.

3. Living so largely by themselves, Japanese naturally continue the standards and modes of life in which they were reared. They receive relatively little American influence. From the American standpoint many of their native habits are objectionable. They habitually work on Sunday; overcrowd their dwellings; they often live in unsanitary and unsightly conditions. Moreover, so many of the women work on the land that they cannot make a proper home life and cannot rear the children according to American standards.

4. Social relations between whites and Japanese are difficult to establish and maintain, partly because of mutual ignorance of each other's language, partly because the standards of

life are so different, partly because the feeling engendered by economic competition is unfriendly and partly because of instinctive and cultivated race prejudice.

5. Japanese men, like European men (and unlike the Chinese) have brought over their wives and children in unexpected numbers, so that we have thousands of American-born Japanese children. And we foresee tens of thousand more in a few decades. These, by our laws are American citizens.

6. California is now suddenly awaking to the situation thus developing. For years it enjoyed the advantage of cheap, docile, efficient, Asiatic labor. No small part of her prosperity has been made possible by Chinese and Japanese labor on railroads, roads and ranches. California is now discovering that Japanese labor is no longer cheap; that it is enterprising, independent, able. Japanese like every new immigrant group are highly re-productive. It is now certain that we shall have among us a permanent, growing and efficient, Japanese population.

7. The competition of whites with Asiatics on the Pacific Coast in past decades has resulted in the denial to Asiatics of the privileges of naturalization and of citizenship. Of all immigrants to the United States these alone have been thus singled out and humiliated. This condition has tended the more strongly to segregate them as a group always and necessarily un-American. Being "aliens ineligible for citizenship" they have been made the object of discriminatory legislation, both local and national.

The questions arising out of these conditions, according to the agitators, are these:

- (1.) How can Japanese immigration be completely stopped?
- (2.) What drastic legislation can be devised to prevent Japanese from becoming real or virtual land owners?
- (3.) How can Japanese be eliminated as economic competitors?
- (4.) How can conditions of life be made so uncomfortable for Japanese as to lead them in large numbers to return to their native land?

The avowed purpose of the proposed legislation is to secure these ends. Will it? This is our next question.

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE OF THE ANTI-JAPANESE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The planks of the program proposed by the California Oriental Exclusion League have already been given (p. 6).

The **First Plank** proposes to cancel the "Gentlemen's Agreement." This proposal is based on the charge that Japan has

violated that Agreement. Since the charge is not substantiated, for America to cancel it would be an insult to Japan, which America as a self-respecting nation could not afford to give. There is not, therefore, the slightest probability that Congress or the Department of State will do what the agitators desire. We need not consider what Japan's response might be to such an insult if it were given.

Let us suppose, however, that Congress does yield to the urgency of California and formally cancels the Agreement, what would be the result to immigration? The first result would be an immediate return to treaty rights. These allow mutual free immigration—the same as from England or France. Before cancelling the Gentlemen's Agreement therefore, some substitute would have to be adopted. What would it be? Is it thinkable that any new treaty could be negotiated or any special Japanese immigration law could be passed by Congress that would refuse to admit to the United States the wives and children of those Japanese men who are already here? Unless, however, such drastic provisions were made the situation under the new treaty or law would not differ from that which now exists under the "Gentlemen's Agreement." The immigration problem would remain unsolved, even if the proposed "cancellation" program were adopted.

The **Second Plank** in the program proposes to stop the coming of "picture brides." Since the Japanese Government has already announced that it will no longer give passports to "picture brides" this second plank may be regarded as having been secured. The agitators may perhaps be congratulating themselves on this achievement, thinking that from now on an important stream of immigration has been stopped. They are doomed to disappointment for the "picture brides" have all the time constituted only a minor portion of the "wives" admitted. Moreover, it is still open to any Japanese man in America to go to Japan, get married and bring his wife back with him. And this would be the case under any treaty or any law that would be at all likely to be secured. This plank, therefore, though already secured will have little real affect on the problem to be solved. It will not help secure to any appreciable degree any of the objectives of the agitators.

The **Third Plank** of the program—"vigorous expulsion of Japanese immigrants"—assumes that many have been coming in through Japanese violation of the Agreement. If, however, the Agreement has been faithfully observed, as the evidence abundantly shows, there is no occasion for this plank. If Japan by her own action has been vigorously applying the Agreement to all laborers seeking to go to Canada and to Mexico as well as to the United States, it is difficult to see that that plank makes

any contribution whatever to the solution of the problem even as the agitators see it.

No reason whatever has been adduced for the **Fourth Plank** in the program—perpetual exclusion of Asiatics from American citizenship. Until it is reasonably shown that Asiatics, merely because they are Asiatics, are incapable of understanding, appreciating and admiring the ideals of democracy, and would not become loyal citizens, whatever they might profess, this item in the program can hardly be counted as more than an emotional expression of race prejudice. Moreover, it does not readily appear what contribution this plank would make to the solution of the problem, for it would have no effect on the number of Japanese immigrants, nor on the number of babies who will be born here, nor on the industry and powers of mutual cooperation of those Japanese who may compete with whites in agriculture and industry. The writer fails to see any intelligible purpose whatever in this plank.

The **Fifth Plank** is especially objectionable—the proposal to deny American citizenship to every American-born child “unless both parents are of a race that is eligible to citizenship.” This proposal is open to criticism from a number of points.

1. **It would cause endless confusion.** There are already some 30,000 American-born Japanese children in America who with their children through all generations will be American citizens. No law can work retroactively to disqualify them. Only those born after the proposal becomes law would be affected. We would then have two groups of Japanese (and Chinese)—one group consisting of citizens possessing all its privileges and another group, for many decades and perhaps always the smaller group, consisting of those who would be denied these rights and privileges. They would be the objects of drastic economic legislation aimed at “aliens ineligible for citizenship.” What confusion! And what possibilities of injustice to citizens and of fraud by aliens! Could our Government make and preserve proper birth records to keep the two groups distinct? And what would happen in case of marriage across the magic line—to which group would the offspring belong?

2. **It is unjust.** It proposes to cut out of the Constitution one of the great bulwarks of justice for all classes and groups residing in America and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, all of whom are entitled to the “equal protection of the law.” It is a well known principle that in a republic any class permanently deprived of the suffrage is exposed to danger. They can be made the object of wrong-doing and have no natural redress.

3. **It is dangerous.** Such a law would create sharply defined classes of aliens among us permanently and necessarily obedient to foreign governments. American-born children born

hereafter of those Japanese who are not American citizens, will of course, generation after generation be citizens of Japan. Being born here not only their economic interests would be here but also their cultural. They would understand English better than Japanese. They would be completely American in language, customs, ideals. But they would necessarily constitute a growing group whose race-consciousness and resentment would be increasingly developed through special differential treatment, always humiliating and oftentimes unjust. On the ground of their not being eligible to citizenship, economic disabilities of various kinds would be imposed upon them. This condition would force them into ever closer mutual cooperation, mutual sympathy and mutual antipathy to the white race. It would keep them in constant dependence on their alien Government to which they would inevitably turn for protection. They would constitute closely compacted colonies permanently alien, inevitably hostile in spirit and necessarily obedient to an alien government. Such a situation could not fail to deepen the chasm of feeling between the East and the West.

This proposal, therefore, carried into effect, would aggravate the very evil which it professes to solve, and California would be the chief immediate sufferer from such a policy.

4. **It is un-American.** It repudiates a fundamental American principle, well justified by a century of American experience, that American-born children, whatever their ancestry may be, are thorough-going Americans. America ventured on a brand new experiment in political practice—she claimed as her own all American-born children of foreigners. We have contended and have proven our contention, that those who are born and reared here in our American institutions catch the American spirit of freedom—share in the American pride of our history and loyally fulfil their duties as citizens. There is no reason whatever for thinking that under similar friendly treatment American-born Japanese will not make the same response.

5. **It is inhuman.** It proposes that American-born children shall be debarred from American citizenship even though one of the parents is white. If the father is an American and the mother is Japanese, the child will belong to no country, for according to Japanese law the citizenship of both the mother and the child follows that of the husband and father. And Japanese law in this respect is identical with that of every civilized country including the United States. Our laws provide that a foreign woman on becoming the wife of an American citizen becomes an American citizen in whatever land he may live and their children are American citizens in whatever foreign land they may be born. The proposed amendment would reverse this universally recognized principle and practice.

6. **It is reactionary.** The movement of the times is toward

better, freer and more just international and inter-racial relations. This proposal cuts across every high and generous impulse of modern international life. It is reactionary also because it proposes by a constitutional provision to deny to a certain class of people merely on the ground of race the "equal protection of the laws" a provision introduced into the Constitution at the close of the Civil War in order to secure better justice for all classes of people in the United States.

7. It is futile. Even though the proposed amendment were passed, it would not solve a single one of the difficulties aimed at. Its promoters propose by it to stop Japanese from purchasing land. But it would not do even that. If there are already, as they say, 25,000 American-born Japanese children in California, they are of course American citizens. They and their multiplying children and children's children ad infinitum will be citizens with all the rights and privileges of citizens. The proposed amendment would not prevent them from buying land. The real purpose of the proposal, therefore, would not be attained. However drastic may be the land laws enacted to hamper those who are "ineligible to become citizens," those laws would for many decades affect only a minority of the Japanese population in California.

The **Sixth Plank** fathered by Mr. McClatchy and urged by many Californians, if not by the League, is to bring from China hundreds of thousands of Chinese coolies. Mr. Selden, of the "New York Times," writing recently from California says that they want a million! It is not proposed that they bring their wives, nor that they be Americanized and become citizens—by no means. What is wanted is cheap, docile, controlled, Asiatic labor, men who have no ambitions for homes, children, education and opportunity.

If this program is carried out there will develop on the Pacific Coast a situation in many respects not unlike that which developed in the South a century ago through the importation of negro slave labor. Once the system is effectually started, it will be found impossible to get rid of Asiatic labor. California will become increasingly dependent upon it. We shall have a capitalistic, aristocratic, white class exploiting Chinese labor in the development of California's vast natural resources, a large un-Americanized, Chinese speaking, poorly paid working class, and a large class of "poor whites" who are too proud or too weak to work with or like the Chinese and who, lacking ownership of the land and without capital, cannot exploit cheap Chinese labor.

The social, economic, political and racial problems that would surely emerge under such conditions can be easily foreseen.

This proposal also is absolutely un-American and dangerous.

Its proponents are amazingly blind to the real nature of their program. In their anti-Japanese animosity, they are advocating a plan that is intrinsically far more dangerous than the present Japanese problem.

In the light of the foregoing critical study of the program for drastic legislation, we are not justified in the conclusion that none of their planks would to any appreciable degree secure the ends desired by the agitators? Indeed, the writer sees no solution whatever along the line of repressive and segregative, economic and racial legislation, however drastic it may be. The more such a policy is followed the more bitter will become the mutual relations of the whites and the Japanese. The real problem will become more serious and a real solution more difficult.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

So far as the writer can see there are only two possible methods for solving the California Japanese problem that have any promise of success.

The first is mentioned as a whimsical suggestion—scarcely needing serious attention. It is the one and only method, however, that will secure what the agitators desire. It is a financial method. There are in California approximately 50,000 adult Japanese. If the State should offer to pay each adult Japanese who leaves the country permanently the sum of \$2,000, the total expense would be approximately \$100,000,000; and if in addition the Japanese owners of farms were offered twice the value of their land, the expense might be perhaps \$60,000,000. Under the inducement of this bonus plan practically all Japanese of the working, agricultural and small trader classes would return to Japan quite promptly. To be sure many wealthy landlords would be suddenly impoverished; there would be severe farm labor shortage and shortage of berries and garden supplies for some years; and Mexicans would swarm in to fill the gap. But California would be rid of her "Japanese menace." Of course Japanese laborers from other states would flock to California and seek the bonus. It is safe to say, however, that an expenditure of from four to five hundred million dollars would pretty effectually do the trick. The value which Japanese have already contributed to the State, however, is considerable and this amount (\$500,000,000) might well be paid to get them out, if they are in fact the menace alleged.

A GENUINE SOLUTION

If the policy of drastic legislation is not only futile but positively dangerous, and if the policy of deportation by generous bonus payments is quite impracticable, we must find a solution along some other line. The remaining alternative

would seem to be a policy of Americanization, a policy of mutual education and reconciliation.

A genuine and permanent solution is necessarily psychological and moral though it should also include a legislative factor. Two programs of education are needed, one for Japanese and one for Americans. The first would seek by friendly instruction and helpfulness to show Japanese how Americans live, what our ideals and economic standards are and how earnestly we desire to have all foreigners who plan to stay permanently in America learn our language and adopt our good ways as rapidly as possible—not, however, abandoning their own good customs, and participate in supporting our democratic institutions. The rights and the duties of citizens would be fully explained to them and they would be invited, in case they plan to stay permanently in America, to qualify and become citizens. It would introduce Japanese to Americans and urge them to live here in mutual helpfulness, fair play and goodwill. Especial attention would be given to the education of Japanese children, making them feel that they too are Americans.

The program for Americans would seek to give them the real facts of the situation. Falsehoods or even half truths about the Japanese would be steadily discredited and exposed. Steps would be taken to promote a spirit of such helpfulness, cooperation and treatment as would commend to the strangers from Asia the essentials of the Christian religion. Facts as to methods and processes that have been successful in harmonizing Japanese and Americans would be widely reported, such as those that have been so successful at Livingston.

A legislative program is also important. The number of Japanese and Chinese who might be admitted as immigrants should of course continue to be carefully regulated. All those who are lawfully here should be given equal treatment with that accorded to every other group of foreigners and aliens among us. Laws that conflict with treaty obligations should be repealed. Standards for naturalization should be raised and all who duly qualify for citizenship and desire to be naturalized should be granted this privilege, just as it is granted to individuals of every other continent. All radically discriminatory and therefore humiliating laws should be repealed.

In order to overcome particular abuses, laws may be needed to prevent unfair combinations in restraint of trade, unnecessary Sunday work, excessive hours of labor, or unsanitary or immoral living conditions. Legislation fitted to prevent the development of congested areas of a single people or race may also be desirable.

Laws forbidding the purchase hereafter of agricultural lands by any aliens, not even in the names of their minor children may perhaps be desirable. This would be a powerful incentive

to citizenship. Surely aliens who plan for permanent life in America as is indicated by purchase of farm lands, should be American citizens. All such laws should of course be general and apply equally to all aliens and all peoples.

Such a policy as this, followed out constantly for thirty years would gradually solve the Japanese problem in an American and Christian way. American-born Japanese under such conditions would absorb American ideals, modes of life and standards of labor. The strenuous, economic competition now complained of would gradually vanish as the Americanized children take the place of their foreign-born parents. These children would be as characteristically American as the American-born children of any other foreign people. Sunday labor would automatically cease and also the agricultural labor of wives.

The foregoing moral, educational and legislative program for solving the Japanese problem on the Pacific Coast appears to the writer to be the only one in which there is the least hope of success. Its weakness lies in the fact that it is neither sensational nor "political," nor will it secure immediate results.

The policies proposed, however, by the California Oriental Exclusion League can secure no salutary results whatever. They will only aggravate the situation. The Japanese are here with their wives and children, and they are going to stay. How is California going to deal with them? In a spirit of bitter condemnation, twisted statistics, distorted half truths, and increasingly obnoxious and economically discriminatory legislation aimed at "aliens ineligible for citizenship." Such a spirit and such laws will produce only increasing mutual animosity. This is no solution. The only alternative would seem to be the one here urged.

THE CALIFORNIA AGITATION AND JAPANESE MILITARISM

California's anti-Japanese agitators are no doubt sincere in the desire to drive Japanese out of the United States. That they are subsidized by Japanese militarists is suggested by no one. Yet as a matter of fact, Senator Phelan, Congressman Raker, Mr. McClatchy and their co-agitators are playing into the hands of Japanese militarists as effectively as if they were in the latters employ and were deliberately cooperating with them.

Japanese militarists could adopt no more astute policy for the attainment of their ends in China and in the whole Far East than secretly to subsidize just such men in America and keep them on their job until they have secured all the humiliating, discriminatory, and drastic legislation they are urging. For the success of the anti-Japanese agitation in America will exert

a powerful influence on the success of the militaristic program of Japan in East Asia. This plays directly into the hands of the most dangerous and unscrupulous elements in Japan. It gives Japanese militarism the most cogent arguments it could possibly have for promoting anti-American feeling in Japan and for justifying to their own people their past and their future policies of imperial aggression in Korea, Manchuria and China.

Anti-Japanese agitators will no doubt scoff at this argument, for they regard themselves as true and zealous patriots, concerned only with the safety and welfare of America. No doubt they are so in heart, but their logic is faulty and their vision is short. They do not seem to understand the relation of cause and effect in international and inter-racial affairs.

The great American public, however, should not be led astray by blind leaders, however patriotic they may emotionally be. In the lurid light of the recent world tragedy, the causes that produce great conflicts have become quite plain. Let America most carefully avoid them. If America desires to walk in the ways of peace and good neighborliness with the Orient she must choose those principles and policies and those courses of action which will have the desired results.

CONCLUSION

The great world problem of the coming century is that arising from the contact of the White and Yellow races. Shall it be a contact of bitterness, hostility, unfairness and untruth in speech and act? Or shall it be a contact of truthfulness of word and deed, of dogged determination to be kindly and helpful and considerate? Shall we seek war? Or shall we seek peace? The answer is still in our hands. We can create hostile foes by the hundred million among our neighbors across the Pacific, or we can win them to friendship—according as our treatment of those among us on the Pacific Coast is hostile or Christian.

If we desire to keep Asia friendly we must be friendly ourselves. We must get rid of our humiliating anti-Asiatic legislation. We must give to every Asiatic lawfully in the United States the very same treatment including opportunity for citizenship that we give to every other people, including Turks, Syrians, Persians, Russian Tartars, Mexicans, Zulus, Hottentots and Kaffirs. This alone is in fundamental harmony with the spirit and principles of our Republic and our Constitution. This alone is the course required by the Golden Rule. This alone can overcome the Japanese "menace" in California. This alone can lay right foundations for permanent peace between the Far East and the Far West.

